DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 664 TM 021 101

AUTHOR Bond, Linda; And Others

TITLE Surveying the Landscape of State Educational Assessment Programs. EdTalk.

INSTITUTION Council for Educational Development and Research, Washington, D.C.; National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE [93]
CONTRACT RP91002001-10
NOTE 58p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Council for Educational Development and Research, 2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 601, Washington, DC 20036 ($5).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Databases; Data Collection; *Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Interviews; Models; National Surveys; School Districts; Standards; State Legislation; *State Programs; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Participation; *Test Construction; *Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS Performance Based Evaluation; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This publication explores the relationship between state systemic reform initiatives and state student assessment programs using a database established by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory and interviews with state assessment directors in California, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Texas, and Vermont. States throughout the country are actively pursuing systemic educational reform. The survey and interviews reveal that states approach the development of new or revised assessments in the following ways: (1) developing totally new assessments to accompany new goals; (2) reconfiguring or supplementing existing assessments; (3) revising traditional assessment instruments and raising standards; and (4) leaving assessment development to local school districts. The first three approaches are highlighted in this discussion. It appears that there is not a single best model for state assessment and that innovation should be supported and encouraged. Assessment and reform efforts should foster the same goals, and teacher involvement is essential. Quick fixes will not be the answer. If states change assessment without changing instructional practices, there is little likelihood of improved student performance. Appendixes contain a glossary and an overview of assessment practices. Two tables present survey information. (Contains 14 references.) (SLD)

TM

ED 367 664

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Surveying the Landscape

of state educational assessment programs

TM021101

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM

Surveying the Landscape

of state educational assessment programs

Linda Bond

with Lawrence Friedman & Arie van der Ploeg

• *Council for Educational Development and Research* •
• *National Education Association* •

EdTalk is published by the Council for Educational Development and Research
2000 L Street, NW • Suite 601 • Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 223-1593

Dena G. Stoner, Executive Director
Üllik Rouk, Editor
Julie Srodes and Dan Shore, Production Assistants

This project has been funded at least in part with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract numbers RP91002001 through RP91002010. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Regional Educational Laboratories

Northeast Region
The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands
300 Brickstone Square, Suite 900
Andover, Massachusetts 01810
508/470-0098
Director: David P. Crandall

Mid-Atlantic Region
Research for Better Schools
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123
215/574-9300
Director: John E. Hopkins

Appalachian Region
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325
304/347-0400
Director: Terry L. Eidell

Southeastern Region
SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education
P.O. Box 5367
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412
919/334-3211
Director: Roy H. Forbes

Southwestern Region
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701
512/476-6861
Director: Preston C. Kronkosky

Central Region
Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory
2550 South Parker Road, Suite 500
Aurora, Colorado 80014
303/337-0990
Director: C. L. Hutchins

Midwestern Region
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
1900 Spring Road, Suite 300
Oak Brook, Illinois 60521
708/571-4700
Director: Jeri Nowakowski

Northwestern Region
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Avenue, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
503/275-9500
Director: Robert R. Rath

Western Region
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
730 Harrison Street
San Francisco, California 94107
415/565-3000
Director: Dean H. Nafziger

Pacific Region
Pacific Region Educational Laboratory
828 Fort Street Mall, Suite 500
Honolulu, HI 96813
808/533-6000
Director: John W. Kofel

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Preface

A New Era for Student Assessment 1

States as Incubators of Assessment Innovation 3

Profiles of State Assessment Programs 7

California and Vermont Start Fresh *9*

Maryland and Michigan Add to What Is Already There *17*

Indiana and Texas Explore New Approaches Cautiously *24*

A Cavalcade of Change 31

Findings and Recommendations 33

References 37

Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms 39

Appendix 2: An Overview of State Assessment Programs 43

Acknowledgments

Preface

The Council for Educational Development and Research established the *EdTalk* publication series as a way to inform a variety of audiences about nationally significant topics in education. This publication explores the relationship between state systemic reform initiatives and state student assessment programs. It stems from a common interest in systemic education reform by the Council, its regional educational laboratory membership, and the National Education Association (NEA).

In systemic reform, changes in one part of the educational system are integrated with changes in another part. Expectations for students, school curriculum, instruction and instructional materials, teacher preparation, certification and inservice, and school organization and governance all work together so that the entire system moves toward the same goals. The Council, an association that provides the latest information from educational research and development to educators and policymakers, wanted to know how state student assessment programs are leveraging state systemic reform initiatives. With all the evidence pointing to state student assessment programs affecting how teachers teach and what students learn, not surprisingly, NEA, with its 2.5 million teacher members, had a keen interest in the same question.

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) houses a state student assessment program database, developed in collaboration with the Council of Chief State School Officers.* NCREL used this database, which contains up-to-date information from the annual Association of State Assessment Programs' survey of the nation's state assessment directors, to conduct this study. In addition to analyzing the findings in the database, NCREL interviewed state assessment directors on the relationship between assessment and reform in the six states it profiled — California, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Texas, and Vermont.

By publishing this paper, we aim to give educators, policymakers, and others interested in the topic of educational assessment a look at the range of different state assessment programs being implemented across this country to leverage systemic reform.

* Ed Roeber of the Council of Chief State School Officers has single-handedly collected state assessment information for over fifteen years. He worked closely with NCREL on the conversion of the survey to database format, and consulted on the design of this study. His thorough editing of this paper is also gratefully acknowledged.

A New Era for Student Assessment

Advocates of educational improvement are pressing for "systemic" reform. Systemic reform strategies aim to transform all parts of the educational system in a coordinated way. Curriculum; instruction and instructional materials; local, state, and national assessment; school organization and governance; and teacher preparation and inservice are all synchronized to work together toward a common set of agreed-upon standards for student achievement.

Of all these areas, student assessment* is increasingly being used to leverage systemic reform. How student assessment is organized and documented, and what it means for students and schools, has taken center stage in the debate about systemic reform. The purpose of this paper is to provide a quick review of the issues that are emerging in this debate. It illustrates why decisions about student assessment are often made the way they are.

... student assessment is increasingly being used to leverage systemic reform.

Calls for a nationwide assessment system that holds all students, schools, local districts, and states accountable for student achievement are echoing through Congress. Assessment plays a pivotal role in most state reform strategies. Furthermore, Secretary of Education Richard Riley brought with him from his South Carolina governorship a staunch belief that testing can stimulate educational reform. Similarly, as governor of Arkansas, President Clinton advocated testing to measure students' academic progress. Many other governors are relying on testing to raise school performance by holding educators accountable for their students' test results.

Nearly a decade of test-driven educational reform has shown that educators do indeed match their teaching to the skills and knowledge tested on state assessments. This is particularly true when test scores are the deciding factor in determining sanctions or rewards.[1] One consequence of this

* Student assessment refers to any in-depth method of determining what students know and can do, including testing, teacher observations, collections of students' work (portfolios), projects, and performances. It is considered to be more comprehensive than testing which typically employs a one-time, paper-and-pencil measure.

practice is that a tension has developed between what is known to be top-notch instruction and what is actually on the test. On the one hand, there is a growing consensus that schools should instruct students in complex, problem-solving skills; on the other hand, most present-day assessment programs still revolve around multiple-choice tests of basic skills.

Many states are trying to resolve the conflict by promoting a systemic reform agenda based on new standards for student performance. As the Mathematical Sciences Education Board of the National Research Council put it:

> Calls for standards in education have been echoing across the nation for several years, especially since political leaders of both parties decided to adopt bipartisan national goals for education. Standards without appropriate means of measuring progress, however, amount to little more than empty rhetoric. To stay the course, we must measure the things that really count.[2]

Surveying the Landscape of State Educational Assessment Programs describes the variety of state assessment programs being planned or already operating in this country.[3] It also tells how six states used assessment to foster their own unique state approaches to systemic reform. While, other states are significantly changing their assessment programs as well, these six states were chosen because they represent a *range* of state assessment strategies. The small number of state assessment programs studied limits this report — as does the fact that state assessment is changing rapidly and new ideas are being invented every day. Nonetheless, the triumphs and challenges in these six states bring new policy-relevant information to the educational assessment debate.

... states are adjusting their assessment programs to meet their individual needs.

This report does not suggest that there is a right way or a wrong way to conduct state assessment. It does demonstrate that states are adjusting their assessment programs to meet their individual needs. It is clear that no one model fits all the assessment needs in education reform.

A glossary has been included in Appendix 1 to ensure a common understanding of assessment terms, although some key terms have been defined on the pages where they first appear. Appendix 2 presents a summary of state assessment programs nationally.

States as Incubators of Assessment Innovation

Systemic school reform is having a dramatic impact on state assessment strategies. The number of states with mandated student assessment programs has grown from 29 in 1980 to 46 in 1992.[4] Each state assesses three or four grade levels, on average. This means that at least one-third of all public elementary and secondary students participate in state-conducted assessments each year.[5]

States are embracing new and exciting approaches to student assessment. These assessment programs reflect new expectations for students, new purposes and methodologies, and new links between assessment and instruction. All across the country, state assessment programs have become incubators of assessment innovation.

The state assessment landscape is as varied as it is dynamic. Some states are developing totally new assessments to measure new learner outcomes — those things students should know and be able to do as a result of their educational experience. Other states are revising their old assessment instruments and raising standards for student performance. Some states are supplementing existing student assessments with newer assessments. A number of states are encouraging local school districts to take the lead in assessment reform, and to involve teachers in developing assessments, setting standards, and scoring.

States are embracing new and exciting approaches to student assessment.

Much of the current activity was brought about because as states identified new learning outcomes for their students, they realized that many of the skills they sought (for example, creative problem-solving and teamwork skills) could not be assessed with traditional, multiple-choice tests. This led them to explore innovative student assessment strategies. The two most common approaches to innovative student assessment are performance assessment, which assesses a student's actual performance of a complex skill or task, and the creation of portfolios, in which a collection of a student's work is scored as a whole.

Seventeen states report using performance assessments and six states report using portfolios. Of these, four states — Arizona, California, Kentucky, and New Mexico — use both. Most states have extended their testing programs with these procedures; that is, they are implementing the newer assessments but still administering either their criterion-referenced test (CRT)*, a norm-referenced test (NRT)**, or both. The three exceptions are Massachusetts, which reports using only performance and writing assessment; Vermont, which relies primarily on portfolio assessment but also administers a short criterion-referenced test in mathematics and a writing sample; and Kentucky, which plans to use performance assessments and portfolios but currently uses a "transitional" multiple-choice and short answer test.

Seventeen states report using performance assessments and six states report using portfolios.

Many other states report that although they would like to expand alternative assessment, so far their changes have not been dramatic. They give the following reasons for not changing more rapidly:

1. **Accountability constraints.** Assessments that are used to promote students or to award high school diplomas must be grounded in what students are taught now. Assessing students on curricula not yet in place and using the results to make promotion and graduation decisions would leave school districts open to court suits.

2. **Technical constraints.** The technical quality of new assessments is still being researched. States are hesitant to embrace assessments that may not yield reliable and valid results.***

3. **Professional development constraints.** The new curricula and assessments require an approach to education that is very different from present practice. The lack of professional development for teachers and principals is hampering states' ability to change instruction.

---

* Criterion-referenced tests measure student performance on an agreed-upon set of skills and against an agreed-upon standard. They are traditionally multiple-choice tests.

** Norm-referenced tests compare student test performance against that of other students, usually a national sample.

*** Reliable assessment results remain the same regardless of when or by whom the assessment is administered, or by whom the results are scored. Assessments are considered valid when they measure what is supposed to be measured. For example, if a student receives a score of 4 on an assessment of problem solving, that score should be an accurate reflection of the student's problem-solving ability (validity) no matter who is rating that student's response or when the response is being rated (reliability).

4. **Financial constraints.** Newer assessments are usually more expensive to develop, administer, and score than traditional ones. Many states simply do not have sufficient resources.

Despite difficulties, many states are pioneering new performance-based assessment instruments and improving the content of existing assessments in order to promote systemic reform.

Profiles of State Assessment Programs

Calls to improve the match between assessment and the new learner outcomes demanded by educational reform first sounded in the late 1980s. By the 1990s, reformers clamored for a complete change from conventional practice, including changes in expectations for students; changes in curriculum and instructional practices; changes in how student learning is assessed; and changes in the roles, rules, and responsibilities of those who participate in the educational system.

New expectations call for students to become active and engaged learners who are more responsible for their own learning. In the industrial model of schooling, still in operation in many places, students are passive recipients of knowledge. They are expected simply to memorize and recall information. Grades reflect accuracy and independent work. These are the same characteristics that an industrial society once required of workers. But today, technology dominates the workplace. Information quickly becomes obsolete. Memorizing and recalling information is not enough. Students must use their minds to apply knowledge to complex problems, communicate their ideas clearly to others, work cooperatively in groups, and find solutions to real-life problems. Thus, students need to acquire the tools for in-depth inquiry and problem solving, as well as to learn important definitions, facts, and skills. The goal of education reform is to provide students with a better balance between the old core of memorizing and repeating and the new core of inquiry, thinking, communicating, and problem solving. Achieving this goal requires changing the many parts of the educational system.

The goal of education reform is to provide students with a better balance between the old core of memorizing and repeating and the new core of inquiry, thinking, communicating, and problem solving.

Because reform and assessment do not fall into the "one size fits all" category, each state approaches them differently. This section illustrates how states have designed their reform and assessment programs to fit their needs. It discusses how states tailor their assessment programs according to the

purposes to which they put the results. Over and over again, it shows how the national focus on higher standards and new learner outcomes is driving assessment reform in states.

The six state assessment programs described here demonstrate the range of assessment programs being implemented across the country. These states differ in the speed with which they are changing their assessment programs and the factors that are influencing their ability to change.

The first two, California and Vermont, are developing totally new assessments to accompany new educational goals and learner outcomes. Financial constraints, however, are placing great stress on each state's ability to provide accompanying high-quality professional development. In addition, Vermont, which gives local schools a lot of flexibility in assessment, is learning that the lack of centralized quality control can limit the usefulness of assessment results for making decisions.

... states differ in the speed with which they are changing their assessment programs and the factors that are influencing their ability to change.

Maryland and Michigan are supplementing their existing student assessment programs with newer assessments. Both are balancing their desire to implement newer forms of assessment with financial, legal, technical, and professional development constraints. They are using traditional assessments for student accountability purposes and newer assessments for school and instructional improvement.

Finally, Indiana and Texas are retaining their traditional assessment instruments but revising them to include new learner outcomes, as well as raising their standards for student performance. They are adopting newer approaches to assessment slowly. The reason is that these states use the results of student assessment programs to make decisions about individual students. Should a student sue the state because the test unfairly denied him or her a high school diploma or promotion to the next grade, the state must be able to prove that the assessment is technically sound and measures only what is taught in school.

California and Vermont Start Fresh

Some states have decided that only a "revolutionary" approach to assessment can change school practice. These states are abandoning their old assessment methods and replacing them with new ones, or they are designing first-time assessment programs that rely primarily on alternative assessment. California, for example, is responding to two recent legislative mandates — one that requires performance assessment and the other that requires reporting individual scores instead of school scores. Vermont has a major challenge as a state that only recently adopted state assessments, to ensure the technical quality of its assessment results while keeping teachers highly involved in developing and scoring the state assessment.

Some states have decided that only a "revolutionary" approach to assessment can change school practice.

California

In response to state legislation, California is changing its assessment program in two major ways. First, it is moving toward performance assessment as a means to improve instruction for students. Second, whereas California used to report out only school scores on assessments, it is now beginning to report out individual student scores. Making both these changes at once has proven to be an extremely challenging task.

California's Learning Assessment System (CLAS) has three components:

- **Elementary, middle grades, and high school performance assessments** in reading, writing, and mathematics have been adopted for grades 4, 8, and 10. These yielded school-level results in 1992-93, and will yield individual results at grades 4 and 8 in 1993-94. Performance assessments in science and history/social studies were field tested in grades 5, 8, and 10 in 1992-93 and will yield fifth-grade school-level results in 1993-94 and individual results in 1994-95.

- **Golden State Examination (GSE)** is a series of voluntary exams that students take at the end of their coursework in a subject. The GSE was first administered in 1987 in high school algebra, geometry, biology, chemistry, economics, and U.S. history. Additional subject exams are being developed in English composition and in science. The exams include alternative assessment strategies such as essays, laboratory experiments, and portfolios.

- **Career-Technical Assessment Program (C-TAP)** consists of voluntary, end-of-program exams covering such fields as animal science, computer technology, construction technology, health systems, and home economics/child care. C-TAP is still under development at Far West Laboratory in San Francisco.

The California Department of Education has made the development of a variety of assessments to measure higher-level thinking skills a major priority. These assessments will include more sophisticated multiple-choice questions (i.e., questions that require students to make connections among several concepts and/or use more than one strategy to arrive at the correct answer), short answer questions, essay questions, and performance assessment.[6] When California's assessment system is fully implemented, student assessment will be based on a combination of assessments, some of which will be embedded in curricula and portfolios.

... the primary purpose of California's new assessment system is to support the instruction called for in the state's curriculum frameworks.

Purpose of Assessment

State legislation specifies that the primary purpose of California's new assessment system is to support the instruction called for in the state's curriculum frameworks. These curriculum frameworks are the structure on which schools build their curricula. They typically outline the knowledge and skills students are expected to learn. The new components of the assessment system challenge students to perform tasks that demonstrate their acquisition of these skills and knowledge. The curriculum frameworks have been the focus of a great deal of professional development in California's schools.

In addition to supporting its curriculum frameworks, California expects its assessment program to provide information on how well schools and school

districts are performing. Both school and school district results will be reported to the public. School results will indicate the percentage of students in the school at each of six performance levels. District results will show the percentage of students who met statewide performance standards in each subject area.

Impact of Assessment on Students

Until this latest legislation, students in California participated in the state's assessment program but did not receive individual scores. Student scores were combined into school and school district scores, which became part of an annual accountability report to the public on overall student achievement.

Beginning in the 1993-94 school year, students in grades 4, 8, and 10 will receive individual scores in reading, writing, and mathematics. Secondary school students also take the Golden State Examination end-of-course and end-of-program assessment series if their school chooses to administer them. Assessments in science and history/social science will be phased in as funding permits. The new legislation requires that, by the end of grade 12, each student will have an "Individual Record of Accomplishment." This is a portfolio that includes student scores on state assessments, voluntary Golden State Exam results in academic subjects, any Career-Technical Assessment Exams that the student has taken, and other indicators of achievement.

Regardless of the choices states make in reform and assessment, trade-offs are inevitable.

In addition to receiving individual test results, students may notice other differences: first, the kind of assessment being used and, second, a much closer link between assessment and instruction. Reformers' intent is that, with appropriate staff development, teachers will change their instructional practices and ways of evaluating student work.

Assessment and Reform

Regardless of the choices states make in reform and assessment, trade-offs are inevitable. Strengthening an assessment's utility for one purpose weakens it for another. California is a state that, because of its size and tradition of innovation, has for some years been moving toward fundamental changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The state now faces two major hurdles. The first is technical. The second hurdle is posed by a shortage of time and money.

Technical challenges face every state assessment program, but they are particularly great for states that are switching to performance assessments. These states must ensure that their performance assessments are technically sound — that is, they must ensure the reliability, lack of bias, and comparability of their assessments for all the purposes for which they are being used. California has an active research effort underway, both in the state education department and by numerous outside contractors, and a policy of adopting innovative assessments only as the research warrants their use. However, because California does not use assessments to make decisions about individual students, it is less constrained in its approach to assessment than some other states. It also balances performance assessments and portfolios with more traditional forms of assessments when these are appropriate.

California's second major hurdle is to overcome the constraints of time and money so that it can fulfill its new mandate to provide individual scores. To obtain a school district or school building score, fewer activities are generally necessary than to obtain a reliable individual score. The shift to performance assessment complicates this issue because performance assessment takes more time and is more costly than traditional testing. So questions remain ... Can enough examples of a student's work be collected to adequately assess that student's knowledge and understanding of the material? Can examples be collected that cover enough of the material to consider the assessment results a good overall description of the curriculum goals? To relieve some of these concerns, California is supplementing its state assessment with portfolio assessments that are embedded in students' everyday work in order to ensure that sufficient student information is available for a good estimate of achievement.

... because California does not use assessments to make decisions about individual students, it is less constrained in its approach to assessment than some other states.

Vermont

Vermont is one of only a handful of states that has never had a statewide assessment program. Its attempt to implement a traditional, standardized test in 1989 was so criticized by educators that the state dropped the plan. Although its present assessment program is voluntary, most school districts do participate.

Vermont's state assessment program has two components:

- **Writing and mathematics portfolios** are developed and scored in grades 4 and 8. All students in these grades develop portfolios, but only a sample of the portfolios are included in the official state assessment. A grade 10 portfolio in mathematics is being planned. Discussions are also underway to establish a fine arts portfolio.

- **Uniform test results** in mathematics and writing in grades 4 and 8 are placed in the portfolio and used, in part, to confirm portfolio ratings.

Two features of Vermont's assessment program make it popular among many of the state's educators according to recent study conducted by the RAND Corporation.[7] First, Vermont's teachers and students are actively involved in selecting student work to be placed in the portfolios. Teachers actually grade their own students' portfolios. Second, there is no accountability tied to the program, either for students or schools.

... Vermont's teachers and students are actively involved in selecting student work to be placed in the portfolios.

During the 1992-93 school year, fourth and eighth graders in participating school districts began compiling portfolios in mathematics and writing. These portfolios hold work samples that reflect the student's mastery of seven state mathematics criteria and five writing criteria. Portfolios also contain the results of the state's uniform assessment in mathematics and writing.

Purpose of Assessment

Vermont's director of assessment describes the assessment program as having two primary purposes. It is "a means of supporting effective instruction which benefits all students," and "a means of providing accurate information for program evaluation." At the present time, information on student achievement from portfolios is used to improve instruction and to let teachers, parents, and students know how well students have mastered state criteria in writing and mathematics. The state clearly intends to hold schools accountable for portfolio results, but only after it is sure the results are reliable enough to do so. State education agency officials say, however, that it is not their intent to use portfolios to determine if students have fulfilled high school graduation requirements or to assign students grades.

Impact of Assessment on Students

Vermont is the only state in which portfolios are the backbone of assessment. The RAND study found that student attitudes toward portfolios are predominantly positive, mainly because students enjoy producing the projects that are placed in them.[8]

Unlike most states that collect a single sample of student work by administering a standardized test, both revisions and samples of students' best work are placed in portfolios. The learner outcomes considered most important are those that students achieve by solving problems, writing across the curriculum, producing original work, and using higher-order thinking skills, such as considering contradictory information and deciding on a course of action even though uncertainty exists.

Vermont's uniform test in writing contains standard writing exercises; the uniform mathematics test contains multiple-choice items and open-ended problems. All students in grades 4 and 8 take these uniform tests, which are intended to supplement the portfolios. These tests, however, are not intended to be the primary instruments in Vermont's assessment system.

Vermont is the only state in which portfolios are the backbone of assessment.

Assessment and Reform

The state's goal is to integrate its assessment system into everyday instruction and let teachers tailor assessment to classroom instruction. Because of this, changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment are expected to occur in concert.

A major challenge for Vermont has been making its assessment reliable so that scores are comparable across the state and reflect differences in student performance, not teachers' confusion about what the instructional goals mean or how to teach them. In the first and second years of implementation, student achievement could be reported on a statewide basis only because results for any group smaller than that were not reliable. One reason is that because teachers interpreted the scoring criteria differently, they did not always give the same score to similar quality work. Consequently, a score in one part of the state did not necessarily mean the same thing as the same score in another part of the state.

Insufficient teacher training in the scoring criteria was one cause of the problem. Vermont has developed general criteria to guide teachers as they score student work in writing and problem solving. As a rule, these criteria can be applied to many samples of writing and problem solving; they are not tied to a specific task. This allows teachers to place samples of student work that are representative of classroom instruction in the portfolios, but it also means that teachers must be able to recognize good writing and/or problem solving.

According to the director of Vermont's assessment program, while teachers and administrators did attend training sessions in selecting and scoring portfolio content, the training itself was inadequate and uneven across the state. Variations in training made it difficult to compare portfolio scores across schools and classrooms. Reliable results on the uniform test were available, however, and Vermont intends to release these results at the school and district level.

Vermont has improved the reliability of its assessment results (at least in mathematics) by establishing regional scoring centers where scorers rate a sample of portfolios from each region. This use of regional scoring centers is a temporary measure, however, and Vermont still plans for teachers to do all of their own scoring once they have had sufficient professional development.

The RAND Corporation evaluated the first two years of Vermont's assessment program. In a survey of teachers, it found other, more positive changes emerging from Vermont's portfolio assessments. Many teachers report having changed their instructional approach as a result of the portfolio project. For example, they report that students are writing more in the classroom and are spending more time on problem-solving tasks. There is also evidence of positive change in mathematics instruction. Eighty-two percent of the teachers who responded to the RAND survey reported an increase in the amount of instructional time they devoted to mathematics problem solving, while 49 percent reported spending less time on computation than before.[9] It appears that a substantial number of teachers recognize that the changes in assessment support the goals of reform. Many schools have shown their confidence in the project by expanding the use of portfolios beyond the two grades in the state's assessment program.

Many teachers report having changed their instructional approach as a result of the portfolio project.

While Vermont has been severely criticized for its assessment results not being reliable, it has also been applauded for seeking a remedy to the problem that stays true to the state's original goal of extensively involving

teachers in state assessment. State officials, meanwhile, cite the positive changes in instructional practice that have been reported as a result of the new assessment — less time on rote memory work, more time on solving problems and understanding concepts — and are trying to further enhance this positive effect while improving the reliability of the scoring.

Maryland and Michigan Add to What Is Already There

Maryland and Michigan are two of the many states that are reconfiguring their student assessment programs or supplementing them with newer assessments in order to support systemic reform. Both states have legislative mandates to move toward performance assessment. However, the difficulties in trying to collect reliable data on student achievement for high school graduation decisions have caused one to keep its multiple-choice graduation test and the other to consider implementing such a test.

Maryland has added an extensive new performance assessment that yields school-level information for instructional improvement purposes, yet it retains its traditional, basic skills high school graduation test. Michigan, which has a history of designing innovative assessments, is adding a high school graduation test that could end up being less innovative than the state's core assessment program simply because it must be legally defensible.

Maryland

Maryland's School Performance Program was established in 1989. The first assessments were administered in 1991. However, because the performance-based, criterion-referenced test cannot, in its present form, yield results that are reliable enough for making decisions about whether or not students have met the requirements for high school graduation, the state has retained a multiple-choice graduation test implemented in the 1970s "for the time being." Some confusion created by one state assessment program containing two very different approaches to assessment, even though they are for very different purposes, appears to be unavoidable at present.

The components of Maryland's state assessment program are:

- **Criterion-referenced assessments** are administered in mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and writing to samples of students in grades 3, 5, and 8. These assessments consist of open-ended questions, essays, and performance assessments

based on Maryland's new curriculum frameworks. Approximately 350 teachers have helped to develop the performance assessments. An additional 600 teachers are paid to score the assessments over the summer.

- **The High School Functional Graduation Test** is a minimum competency test that all students must pass to graduate. This test, made up of traditional, multiple-choice questions, is first given in grade 7. Most students pass it by grade 9. A school's annual performance report shows both the percentage of students who meet satisfactory or excellent standards of performance the first time they take the test and the percentage who do not meet standards.

- **The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills/4** is a norm-referenced, shelf* test in basic-skills. It is given to a sample of students in each district for use in national comparisons.

Beginning in 1994, the state will administer a new criterion-referenced school performance assessment to students in grade 11 as well. This assessment will include both a state component, made up of assessments in specific subjects and interdisciplinary performance tasks, and a local component consisting of portfolios and projects.

Purposes of Assessment

According to the state director of assessment, Maryland's assessment program sets out "to insure that all students in Maryland learn rigorous content during their educational experiences." Different components of the program, however, serve different purposes.

The purpose of Maryland's criterion-referenced assessments is to hold the schools accountable for student achievement and to help them improve their programs. Each school's performance is rated using a number of indicators, including student assessment results, promotion rates, graduation completion rates, and student attendance and dropout rates. Each fall schools receive the results of their previous year's criterion-referenced assessments. Shortly after that, the results are made public. School scores tell what percentage of students in grades 3, 5, and 8 meet excellent or satisfactory proficiency levels on the assessments. Schools must develop and implement a school improvement plan based on the analysis of their strengths and weaknesses.

* A shelf test is one that can be bought "as is" from a test publisher. It is typically based on common elements of most schools' curricula as determined by standard textbooks.

Even though the state is moving away from norm-referenced assessment and using fewer multiple-choice items, the high school graduation test and the norm-referenced Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills/4 remain key components of Maryland's state assessment program. The state has several reasons for retaining these tests. First, multiple-choice graduation tests produce individual student scores. They are defensible in court. Second, the norm-referenced test yields national comparative information and is the only form of assessment that is currently accepted for Chapter 1 evaluation. Nonetheless, these two assessments, along with their very different content, give teachers conflicting messages about what is important for students to learn. In the future, the state intends to allow schools to waive the high school graduation test for students who perform satisfactorily on the eighth-grade criterion-referenced assessment.

While the newer assessments take more time, their design resembles good instruction and students enjoy them.

Impact of Assessment on Students

The high school graduation test is the only assessment in which all students participate and receive individual scores. The CTBS/4 yields individual scores but is taken by samples of students. In all, each student takes about a third of the test. Similarly, the criterion-referenced assessments are taken by only a sample of students, with some students taking some parts of the test and other students taking other parts. While the newer assessments take more time, their design resembles good instruction and students enjoy them. Since only a sample of students participate in the criterion-referenced assessments, the time schools must set aside for assessment is more manageable than it would be if the assessment were administered to everyone.

Assessment and Reform

Since Maryland's new performance assessment program holds schools accountable and is aimed at helping them improve, it does not face the same constraints as assessment programs that lead to decisions about students. Since each participating student is tested on only one portion of the assessment, the state is able to administer the entire assessment to arrive at a school score. Individual student performance results are returned to schools, but the state urges schools not to over-interpret them because they may not reflect the student's proficiency on the entire curriculum. Each student is assessed in each content area, however, and the results do provide an additional source of information about student achievement if used cautiously.

The state is committed to performance assessment and plans to make it the central feature of its student assessment program. Unlike Vermont, which involved a great many teachers in developing its performance assessment program and has teachers scoring their own portfolios, Maryland worked closely with a national test publisher. This has limited the local flexibility that is both the strength and the Achilles' heel of the Vermont program. On the other hand, Maryland's program is more centrally controlled than Vermont's, and so yields more reliable assessment results.[10] However, central control may impede the kind of local ownership and program buy-in that characterizes the Vermont program. Trade-offs are inevitable and states must decide which trade-offs they are most comfortable with, and design their assessment programs accordingly.

Michigan

Michigan, which has had a state assessment program for approximately 25 years, is considered a leader in the development of innovative multiple-choice and performance assessments. Right now, the state assessment program has two major components. The state legislature recently required that a third component be added in the form of a high school graduation test that would ensure that students graduate from high school with necessary skills for success. Legal constraints imposed by this high school graduation requirement may slow the development of innovative assessments in that state.

Michigan ... is considered a leader in the development of innovative multiple-choice and performance assessments.

When this third component is fully developed, Michigan's Educational Assessment Program will consist of:

- **The Michigan Educational Assessment of Progress (MEAP)** is a multiple-choice test administered at grades 4, 7, and 10 in reading and mathematics, and at grades 5, 8, and 11 in science. It is nationally regarded as among the most innovative multiple-choice tests in the country.

- **Michigan Employability Skills Portfolio** was designed primarily as a resume-building exercise for high school students. This portfolio demonstrates that the student has mastered Michigan employability skills. Students share it with prospective employers or post-secondary educational institutions.

- **Michigan High School Graduation Test** (under development) will be administered for the first time in 1994-95 and will become a graduation requirement for the class of 1997.

Purposes of Assessment

Until recently, the sole purpose of Michigan's assessment program was to identify students who needed remedial assistance to meet the state's educational standards. Legislative action in March, 1989, increased school accountability by requiring schools to submit Annual Educational Reports to the State Board of Education and to the public.

With these changes plus the addition of the High School Graduation Test, the primary purpose of state assessment shifted from diagnosing student and school weaknesses to holding students and schools accountable for their performance. Michigan is promoting changes in the educational system that match the outcomes that will be measured on the state assessment.

... the primary purpose of state assessment shifted from diagnosing student and school weaknesses to holding students and schools accountable for their performance.

Impact of Assessment on Students

Although schools have always been under pressure to perform well on the MEAP because test scores are reported in the newspapers, the addition of a high school graduation test will increase pressure on individual students. The extent of that pressure will depend largely on how teachers and principals react to the new accountability requirements.

Schools are accustomed to receiving MEAP results during the winter and providing extra help to students who do not satisfactorily meet state standards. The state distributes compensatory education funds to schools according to the number of students who need assistance. Prior to its requirement that students pass a high school graduation test, Michigan set its standards intentionally high to reflect "world-class" levels. As a result, many students scored less than satisfactorily.

Implementation of a high school graduation test changes this. Because the results of the high school graduation test will be used to award high school diplomas and the test must be able to meet legal challenges, it can measure only what is taught, not what the state may consider "world-class" standards.

The assessments must also meet rigorous technical quality standards. The danger, though, is that other parts of the assessment system may continue to measure and encourage the teaching of these higher standards, sending teachers a double message about what is important to teach.

Assessment and Reform

Michigan faces two major challenges. First, the move to a strong student accountability system limits the content of the assessment to what is actually taught. Newer content based on revised learner outcomes will need to be phased into the assessment only after it has become a part of the school's curriculum. Second, the move to greater accountability has been coupled with a legislated mandate to use performance-based assessment strategies. Since any assessment that is used for student accountability requires evidence of technical quality, and since "technical quality" for performance assessment is still being defined and researched, implementation of the newer assessments may be slowed down considerably.

Newer content based on revised learner outcomes will need to be phased into the assessment only after it has become a part of the school's curriculum.

The state's graduation test has already had an impact on student standards. The legislature adopted a lower standard on the high school MEAP test in order to use the assessment program to endorse high school graduation. Until the graduation test is in place, the state is affixing an official seal to the diplomas of students who have passed the MEAP test. The Michigan Department of Education plans to address this dilemma of lower standards by releasing two sets of standards for the High School Graduation Test, one that matches current curricula and student performance levels, and another for the year 2000 that encourages schools and students to reach beyond present expectations.

Michigan's legislation created financial and technical dilemmas as well. It requires the state education agency to develop a graduation test that includes open-ended, performance tasks. However, performance assessment costs more than traditional assessment. During its 1993 session, the legislature eliminated property taxes as a source of school funding but did not replace them with another funding source (the legislature has a year to find alternative funding). Consequently, the funding of performance assessment is "iffy" at best.

In addition, an expert panel commissioned by the State Board of Education and funded by North Central Regional Educational Laboratory has warned against using such an assessment for graduation until the technical quality can be assured. This will also cost money and time, two commodities Michigan education is lacking.

The Michigan Department of Education is fully cognizant of these challenges and has been proactive in addressing them. First, it has sought legislation to change the high school graduation test mandate to a special seal which is affixed to a student's diploma if he or she has passed the test. Second, it has called together a panel of educational, legal, and psychometric leaders to help improve the accountability focus of the test. Finally, it has commissioned a group of experts in curriculum and assessment to plan a new assessment system.

Indiana and Texas Explore New Approaches Cautiously

Indiana and Texas look to accountability as their major approach to improving the achievement of schools and students. To measure the knowledge and skills that are the goals of their educational reforms, both states are raising their standards for student performance and revising their traditional assessment instruments to reflect new learner outcomes. They are exploring other, newer approaches to assessment cautiously.

Texas, which has several different assessment programs in place, is beginning its exploration of alternative assessment by adding voluntary end-of-course exams for students. The assessment used for high school accountability purposes remains the same for now. In Indiana where a single assessment measures both state and student performance, constraints on changing the program are even greater.

Indiana

Indiana, like many states, is investigating ways to incorporate innovative forms of assessment into its assessment program, but real change is being made slowly. The state's assessment program, Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP), has been used for purposes of holding students and schools accountable since 1988. This largely basic skills test is a customized version of an off-the-shelf*, norm-referenced exam. In other words, the state has added items to the shelf test to align it more closely with outcomes Indiana expects from its students. In the past, a writing sample was also collected from students at several grade levels each year, but funds for this were cut in 1992.

The 1992 Workforce Development Legislation requires a new assessment system based on new learner outcomes (essential skills) that will also be used to measure school and student accountability. In addition, the legislation mandates a high school graduation test.

* Off-the-shelf assessments are pre-developed by test publishers and purchased "as is", although some customization, through the addition or deletion of sections of the test, is possible.

Purposes of Assessment

When asked if Indiana's state assessment program was an information program, an accountability program, or a curricular and instructional improvement program, the director of student assessment replied, "All three and seven others." ISTEP is used both to diagnose school and student weaknesses, and to measure school and student accountability. It has been used to identify which students need remediation, to accredit schools, and to bestow monetary and other awards to schools. Because of this, Indiana's testing program is considered very "high stakes," meaning that test results are used to provide or withhold something of value to students (promotion to the next grade) and schools (accreditation and awards). The Commission for Higher Education also uses ninth-grade ISTEP results to counsel high school students on college preparation. Because Indiana uses a single assessment for several purposes, it has not been able to make dramatic changes to the assessment program. Changing the assessment program for one purpose would weaken it for another. For example, when a state's assessment program is used largely for accountability purposes, the information that it provides about students' strengths and weaknesses is usually inadequate for teachers to use to improve instruction. Indiana is planning to move to a system of assessments, each of which will serve a given purpose. This, clearly, will help.

... Indiana's testing program is considered very "high stakes"...

Impact of Assessment on Students

The state funds remedial service over the summer for students who fail to meet state standards on ISTEP. If, at the end of summer school, students fail to meet the state's standards on a retest, they repeat the grade unless principals and teachers have reason to believe that a student's test result is inaccurate or that staying in the same grade is not in the student's best interest.

ISTEP's emphasis on identifying low-achieving students is the reason for the assessment program's focus on basic skills. Such a focus, however, provides only limited information about middle and upper-achieving students. The new legislation and the essential skills that it mandates will change the content of the assessment system so that it assesses more of the skills called for in state reforms. Still, the speed with which these changes can be made will be restricted by the need to ensure that these new skills have time to find their way into the schools, and that the assessments' technical quality can withstand challenges in court.

Assessment and Reform

Indiana's assessment program faces all of the challenges inherent in an accountability system. Although Indiana's assessment program has never been legally challenged, ISTEP must be technically sound so that it can withstand a legal challenge should one arise. It must also have staying power over time. Since the state awards money to schools that demonstrate improvement on ISTEP and other outcome measures, the content of assessment must be stable from one year to the next. This further constrains the state's ability to radically change its assessment programs.

Despite such constraints and the challenges, Indiana is shifting the content of its state assessment program to reflect new state learner outcomes. In 1992, the Indiana General Assembly mandated two changes in the state's assessment system: it required that the amount of assessment in early grades be decreased and that a high school graduation exam be added. A State Standards Task Force is selecting essential skills that all students must acquire before they can graduate. These standards will be accompanied by new criterion-referenced exams at grades 4, 8, and 10 beginning in the 1993-94 school year. Students who pass the high school exit exam, called the Grade 10 Gateway Exam, will be given a Certificate of Mastery which allows them to select either a predominantly academic or technical program for their last two years of high school.

Indiana, along with many other states, is exploring ways to minimize the "teach one way, assess another" message the state has been sending to educators.

To match the content of assessment more closely with important learner outcomes, Indiana's new criterion-referenced assessment system will include essential skills such as complex problem solving. The state intends to accomplish this by improving the multiple-choice, short-answer, and essay items on the present state-level assessment. Some open-ended mathematics problems are likely to be added to the assessment program and the writing assessment may be restored. A matrix-sampled performance assessment (where some students do some items, while others do the rest) is also being considered. Locally, diagnostic tests and portfolios are being planned for individual students.

Like many states, Indiana must reconcile its reforms with the content of its present state exam. Making curriculum and instruction innovative has been difficult because ISTEP measures traditional skills. Indiana, along with many other states, is exploring ways to minimize the "teach one way, assess another" message the state has been sending to educators.

Texas

Texas is another state that has a history of using assessment to measure how well students and schools are meeting state requirements. Because high school graduation is tied to state assessment, the state has had to defend its assessment in court. In 1992, the Texas legislature mandated that the state assessment be based primarily on students' performance on a variety of complex problem-solving tasks. How Texas integrates performance assessment into its high-stakes accountability system will be interesting for other states to watch.

How Texas integrates performance assessment into its high-stakes accountability system will be interesting for other states to watch.

Texas administers two assessments, the recently implemented Texas Assessment of Academic Skills and the older Norm-Referenced Assessment Program. Both programs are undergoing changes.

- **Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)** is a criterion-referenced exam that is aligned with the essential elements in Texas' state curriculum in reading, writing, and mathematics in grades 4, 8, and 10. In 1994, science and social studies will be added to the TAAS in grades 4 and 8. A student must pass the tenth-grade exit test in order to receive a diploma.

- **The Norm-Referenced Assessment Program** is a standardized test administered in grades 3 through 11 in language, mathematics, reading, science, and social studies. However, only the reading and mathematics tests are state-mandated.

Purposes of Assessment

Texas uses its assessment program to diagnose student weaknesses and to identify which students need remediation, as well as to confer high school diplomas, to accredit schools (as part of a published school performance report), and to present awards to schools. The state provides compensatory education funds to help cover the cost of remedial instruction for students who fail to meet state standards on TAAS. It also plans to provide technical assistance for low-performing schools and staff development for teachers in those subject areas covered by the state assessments.

Impact of Assessment on Students

As in most states where accountability is the major purpose for state assessment, the content of the assessment influences students' educational experience. In Texas, students get remedial help if they do not do well on the state assessment, and do not graduate from high school if they fail to meet state standards on the exit test. In addition, because school accreditation and school awards are based on student performance, it is likely that students spend at least some time preparing for the state assessment. As the state assessment changes to cover more complex skills, students undoubtedly will find that their instructional experiences will include more of these skills. Otherwise, they can claim that they have not had the opportunity to learn the skills on the state assessment. Many states that are moving to performance assessment are counting on their assessment program to have this classroom effect. However, accountability constraints limit what Texas can do.

Texas now requires its assessment system to cover the curriculum in more depth, but at fewer grade levels and with higher student expectations.

Assessment and Reform

The latest wave of reform has not changed Texas' long history of state testing for accountability. In fact, it spurred Texas to upgrade its expectations for students and the content and design of its state assessments. Texas now requires its assessment system to cover the curriculum in more depth, but at fewer grade levels and with higher student expectations. As a result, TAAS tests more complex thinking skills.

Because teachers are known to teach to the items on a high-stakes assessment, the hope is that the shift to performance assessment will change both how teachers teach and the outcomes they expect of students. The Texas Education Agency is counting on the student assessment program to promote the state reform agenda, produce higher standards for all, and improve curriculum and instruction to help students achieve these standards.

Although TAAS will remain in place until 1995, a considerable amount of development and piloting of performance assessments is going on in algebra, biology, computer-based technology, and oral language proficiency, as well as in science and social studies. While TAAS is still a fairly traditional program, made up of criterion-referenced assessment plus a writing sample, it will not

always be so because of its mandated move toward performance assessment. From watching Texas, we can gain an understanding of how a high-accountability, high-innovation state designs performance assessment to measure important new skills, while ensuring that its program can stand up in court.

A Cavalcade of Change

Not surprisingly, states other than the six profiled here are changing their assessment programs in response to systemic reform initiatives. The following examples illustrate the range of changes taking place across the country.

Planning

- Alaska is planning new assessment strategies in reading, mathematics, and science that will replace the nationally norm-referenced Iowa Test of Basic Skills (a norm-referenced, shelf test).

- Florida is preparing to implement a statewide, school-level accountability plan. Portfolio and performance assessments are expected to be critical elements.

- Idaho intends to convert to performance assessment first in language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science, and then in the arts, the humanities, and health and physical education.

- Nebraska, one of the few states that has no statewide assessment program, is contemplating a new accountability system.

- The state education agency in South Carolina plans to recommend that the legislature eliminate all state-mandated student assessments prior to grade 4. It also wants to create a new assessment program featuring alternative assessments based on the state's new curriculum frameworks.

- Wisconsin is working with the Wisconsin Center for Educational Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison to develop performance assessments for its state assessment program.

Starting Small

- The Arkansas state education agency design team is working with six schools to develop curriculum and portfolio assessments in mathematics, and with six other schools to do the same in language arts.

- Kansas is modifying its reading and mathematics assessments and refining its pilot writing assessment in grades 5 and 8.

- Washington developed and is field-testing performance measures to supplement its existing multiple-choice, paper-and-pencil exams.

Moving More Rapidly

- Arizona has introduced statewide performance assessments in grades 3, 8, and 12 in reading, mathematics, and writing.

- By 1995, Delaware expects to assess four grades using new nontraditional assessments matched to the state's new curriculum framework.

- In the 1993-94 school year, North Carolina will replace the California Achievement Tests with new curriculum-referenced, state-developed student assessments and performance measures.

- The state of Minnesota is eliminating Carnegie units as the measure of high school completion and is changing to a system of assessments based on twenty-three learner outcomes. Local schools are developing these assessments with the support of consultants.

Findings and Recommendations

Throughout the United States, states are actively pursuing systemic educational reform. Although none is using exactly the same approach as another, most are seeking ways to tie all parts of the educational system — student expectations, school curriculum, instruction and instructional materials, teacher preparation, certification and inservice, school organization and governance — to a set of standards that better match students' needs for success in the twenty-first century. Because state student assessment programs have been shown to affect how teachers teach and what students learn, great attention is being given to making sure that assessment programs match the goals of systemic reform.

Surveying the 50 state education agencies and conducting in-depth interviews with six of them has revealed that states are approaching the development of new or revised assessment systems with one of four general strategies. The first three strategies were highlighted in this paper: (1) developing totally new assessments to accompany new goals for learner outcomes; (2) reconfiguring or supplementing existing student assessment programs with newer assessments; and (3) revising traditional assessment instruments to account for new learner outcomes and raising standards for student performance. The fourth strategy in state assessment is to leave the development and implementation of assessment programs to local school districts.

A number of factors influence approaches to assessment in the states. They are related to the level of accountability tied to assessment, technical quality issues and the need to withstand legal challenges, the professional development that is available to educators who must implement these changes, and financial resources.

Our study suggests the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. *There is no single best model for state assessment; innovation in the states should be supported and encouraged.* States have different goals for their assessment programs, and different approaches are necessary to meet those goals. The federal government should not impose a single model, but should support the innovation that is taking place and should encourage the states to network and share

ideas. States need help and support from research and development in the area of innovative assessment; they do not need a new national agenda that does not take their needs into account.

2. *If assessment emphasizes basic skills while systemic reform initiatives consider other student outcomes to be more appropriate, teachers will be torn between teaching to the assessment and teaching to the reform.* If high stakes are attached to the basic skills assessment, teachers will focus instruction and reform on basic skills and not on students' application of knowledge and skills. Moreover, changes aimed at restructuring and refocusing the instructional process will not take place.

3. *Teacher involvement, buy-in, and professional development/ technical assistance are needed to sustain reform efforts.* States where teacher buy-in and involvement in the development of the assessment system are pronounced tend to be more successful at influencing change in the classroom. Without teachers being involved and understanding the changes that need to be made, the best assessment in the world will not produce change in the classroom.

4. *Quick fixes are not the answer.* In difficult financial times, states and the national government may be tempted to turn to relatively inexpensive, quick-fix reform interventions, such as using assessment for accountability purposes in lieu of the necessary but more expensive reforms in professional development and instructional practice. They should avoid doing this.

5. *If states change their assessment practices without changing instructional practices, there is little likelihood of improved student performance.* In fact, the newer assessments may do an even better job of documenting low performance simply because they are designed to assess higher-level skills. This will further shake the public's confidence in schools and make investing in schools even less likely in tough financial times.

The states are laboratories for assessment policy. Learning from them may be the best way to collect information about optimal assessment options. Investing in the research and development necessary to make these new forms of assessment work, and determining their impact on students and schools, is a critical federal role.

States are committed to systemic reform that is geared to what students need to know and be able to do to succeed in the twenty-first century. In order for them to be successful, however, all parts of the educational system must be matched to their goals. If state assessments are measuring different goals — because of accountability demands, technical quality issues, lack of professional development, and financial constraints — systemic reform is unlikely to occur.

Too often, curriculum, instruction, and assessment have worked at cross purposes, with high-stakes state assessment results taking priority over what children need to learn. Today, states are working to bring curriculum, instruction, and assessment into better alignment in order to promote the educational changes that reformers have supported for years. The state assessment landscape is filled with purposeful change.

References

1. Bond, L. A. & Cohen, D. A. (1991). In R. Stake (Ed.), *Advances in Program Evaluation: Effects of Mandated Assessment on Teaching*, (Vol. 1B, pp. 75-100. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, Inc.).

   Corbett, H. D. & Wilson, B. L. (1991). *Testing, Reform and Rebellion*, (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation).

   O'Sullivan, R. G. (1991). "Teachers' Perceptions of the Effects of Testing on Classroom Practice" in R. Stake (Ed.), *Advances in Program Evaluation: Effects of Mandated Assessment on Teaching* (Vol. 1B, pp. 145-162. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, Inc.).

   Stake, R. & Theobald, P. (1991). "Teacher's Views of Testing's Impact on Classrooms" in R. Stake (Ed.), *Advances in Program Evaluation: Effects of Mandated Assessment on Teaching*, (Volume 1B, pp. 189-201. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, Inc.).

2. Mathematical Sciences Education Board, National Research Council (1993). *Measuring What Counts* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press).

3. The information in this report is drawn from two sources. Information about state assessment programs comes from the annual Association of State Assessment Programs survey of the nation's state assessment directors. This information is available in the State Student Assessment Programs 1992-1993, a database developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. The second source of information is a series of semi-structured interviews with the assessment directors in the six states.

4. Office of Technology Assessment (1992). *Testing in American Schools, Asking the Right Questions* (Washington, D.C.: Congress of the United States, 297-934 QL 3).

5. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (1993). *A Policy Maker's Guide to High School Graduation Testing* (Oak Brook, IL: Author).

6. This information is taken directly from a California Department of Education Report to the Governor and Legislature, SB 662: "A New Statewide Student Assessment System." *Five Year Cost and Implementation Plan*, 1992.

7. Koretz, D., McCaffrey, D., Klein, S., Bell, R., & Stecher, B. (1992). *The Reliability of Scores from the 1992 Vermont Portfolio Assessment Program* (Washington, D.C.: RAND Institute on Education and Teaching).

8. Koretz, D., Klein, S., McCaffrey, D., & Stecher, B. (1993a). *Interim Report: The Reliability of Vermont Portfolio Scores in the 1992-93 School Year* (October 18, 1994, Washington, D.C.: RAND Institute on Education and Teaching).

9. Koretz, D., Stecher, B., Klein, S., McCaffrey, D., & Deibert, E. (1993b). *Can Portfolios Assess Student Performance and Influence Instruction? The 1992 Vermont Experience* (December, 1993, Washington, D.C.: RAND Institute on Education and Teaching).

10. Reidy, E., Yen, W., Gabrys, R., Hill, R., & Haertel, E. (1993). *The Use of Performance Assessment in High-Stakes Environments: Is There Sufficient Technical Quality for High-Stakes Usage?* A presentation at the Council of Chief State School Officers' National Conference on Large Scale Assessment, June 8-10, 1993 (Albuquerque, New Mexico).

11. Hart, D. (1994). *Authentic Assessment: A Handbook for Educators* (Redding, MA: Addison-Wesley).

Appendix 1:
Glossary of Terms

To help readers understand the assessment issues discussed in this report, we offer the following definitions of common assessment terms. A number of these definitions are adapted from D. Hart's *Authentic Assessment: A Handbook for Educators.*[11]

Alternative assessment: any type of assessment in which students *create* a response to a question or task. In traditional assessments, students *choose* a response from a given list, such as multiple-choice, true/false, or matching. Alternative assessments can include short answer questions, essays, performance assessments, oral presentations, demonstrations, exhibitions, and portfolios.

Analytical trait scoring: judging a performance several times along several different important dimensions. An example might be the judging of a piece of persuasive writing for the author's attention to audience, correct use of grammar and punctuation, focus on the topic, and persuasiveness of argument.

Anchor papers or benchmark performances: examples of performance that serve as a standard against which other papers or performances may be judged. In writing, anchor papers are selected from actual student essays that are considered to exemplify the quality of a performance level of "1", "2", "3", and so forth. If used with analytical scoring, there may be anchor papers or benchmark performances for each trait being assessed.

Authentic assessment: assessment that both mirrors and measures student performance in "real-world" tasks and situations. For example, to assess authentically a student's ability to problem solve, the student is given a real-world problem and assessed on how he or she goes about solving it.

Context (of a performance assessment): the circumstances within which the performance is embedded. For example, problem solving can be assessed in the context of a specific subject (for example, mathematics) or in the context of a real-life laboratory problem requiring the use of mathematics, science, and communication skills. Or, science process skills can be assessed in the context of a large-scale, high-stakes assessment or a classroom grading context.

Criterion-referenced assessment: an assessment designed to reveal what a student knows, understands, or can do in relation to specific performance objectives. Criterion-referenced assessments are used to identify student strengths and weaknesses with regard to specific knowledge or skills that are goals of the instructional program.

Curriculum frameworks: describe what should be taught in order for students to acquire certain skills.

Dispositions: affective outcomes such as flexibility, perseverance, self-confidence, and a positive attitude toward science and mathematics. Some new assessments attempt to measure these outcomes.

Holistic scoring: using a scoring guide and/or anchor papers to assign a single, overall score to a performance.

Matrix-sampling: giving a portion of the assessment to different, representative samples of students so that no student need take the entire assessment. The scores that are obtained are group rather than individual scores, and are often used to look at the performance of a school or school district.

Norm-referenced assessment: an assessment designed to reveal how an individual student's performance or test result ranks or compares to that of an appropriate peer group.

On-demand assessment: assessment that takes place at a predetermined time and place. State tests, SATs, and most final exams are examples of on-demand assessment.

Open-ended tasks: the kind of performance required of students when they must generate a solution to a problem or perform a task when there is no single, right answer.

Open-response tasks: the kind of performance required of students when they are required to generate an answer, rather than select it from among several possible answers, but there is a single, correct response. An example might be: There are four pieces of wood, each measuring seven feet. If you used them as a fence around your square yard, how large an area would you create?

Performance assessment: direct, systematic observation of an actual student performance or examples of student performances and rating of that performance according to pre-established performance criteria.

Performance criteria: a description of the characteristics that will be judged for a task. Performance criteria may be holistic, analytical trait, general, or specific. Performance criteria are expressed as a rubric or scoring guide. Anchor papers or benchmark performances may be used to identify each level of competency in the rubric or scoring guide.

Reliability: an indication of the consistency of scores across evaluators or over time. An assessment is considered reliable when the same answers receive the same score no matter when or how or who does the scoring.

Rubric: an established set of criteria for scoring or rating students' performance on tests, portfolios, writing samples, or other performance tasks.

Scale: the range of scores possible for the student to achieve on a test or an assessment. Performance assessments typically use a 4- to 6-point scale, compared to a scale of 100 or more with traditional multiple-choice tests.

Standard: defines what level of skill students must demonstrate on the learner outcomes.

Standardized assessments: assessments that are administered and scored in exactly the same way for all students. Traditional standardized tests are typically mass-produced and machine-scored and are designed to measure skills and knowledge that are thought to be taught to all students in a fairly standardized way. However, performance assessments can also be standardized if they are administered and scored in the same way for all students. Standardization is an important consideration if comparisons are to be made between scores.

Task (as in a "performance task"): a goal-directed assessment exercise. If the task is authentic, it is designed to elicit from students their application of a broad range of knowledge and skills to solve a complex problem.

Validity: an indication of how well an assessment actually measures what it is supposed to measure. A valid assessment measures what it is supposed to measure and not extraneous features. For example, a valid assessment of mathematics problem solving would be to measure the student's ability to solve a problem, and not the ability to read the problem.

Appendix 2:
An Overview of State Assessment Programs

Table 1 summarizes state assessment activity in each of the 50 states. For each state, the number of separate testing programs within each state, the grade level and subjects tested, the type of assessment used, and the purposes of assessment are included. The totals at the bottom of the chart are column totals.

Table 2 reports the grade levels and subjects tested, and the sampling method used for each of the separate testing components within each state. The totals along the bottom of the chart are column totals.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

ST	#COM	Grades: K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Subjects: L	M	W	SS	Sc	V	Ap	R	Test Type: NRT	CRT	Pr	Pf	WS	Assessment Purpose: K	D	P	G	S	I	PE	A	Ac	SA	ScA	O
AK	2	-	-	-	-	A	V	A	-	A	-	-	V	-	A	A	V	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
AL	6	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	S	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	Y
AR	3	-	-	-	A	A	S	A	A	A	S	A	A	-	A	A	S	A	A	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	S	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y
AZ	3	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-
CA	3	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	E	A	E	E	A	A	A	E	E	E	-	-	-	V	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y
CO	3	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	S	S	-	S	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	S												
CT	2	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-	-
DE	2	-	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-
FL	3	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	A	A	-	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	Y	-	-	-	-	-
GA	5	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	A	A	A	-	-	A	Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
HI	3	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	V	A	V	V	A	A	-	V	V	-	-	-	A	V	-	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y
IA	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ID	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-
IL	1	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	A	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	-	-	Y
IN	1	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-
KS	3	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	-	A	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-
KY	3	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	S	-	-	-	-	S	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	-
LA	4	A	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	A	A	A	-	-	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	Y
MA	1	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	A	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
MD	2	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	-
ME	1	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-	-
MI	1	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	Y	-
MN	1	-	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
MO	2	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-
MS	4	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	-	A	E	E	A	E	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y
MT	1	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y
NC	1	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	E	E	E	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-
ND	2	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-
NE	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NH	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NJ	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	R	A	R	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	Y
NM	4	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-
NV	3	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	R	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-
NY	7	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	E	A	A	A	A	A	E	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-	-
OH	2	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	A	A	R	R	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-
OK	3	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	Y
OR	2	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
PA	1	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	A	-	A	R	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
RI	4	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
SC	2	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	R	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y
SD	2	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	A	-	-	-	A	A	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	Y
TN	3	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	V	-	A	A	V	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	V	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y
TX	2	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	R	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	-
UT	2	V	V	V	V	V	A	V	V	A	V	V	A	V	A	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
VA	2	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	-	Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-
VT	3	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
WA	1	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	-
WI	2	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	Y
WV	3	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	-	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-
WY	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL		3	5	7	26	31	22	26	15	41	22	27	35	16	45	46	36	31	34	4	2	3	34	34	17	6	38	4	23	9	18	8	39	30	41	10	8	5	14

LEGEND:

CELL CONTENTS
- A = All are tested
- S = Sample is tested
- E = End-of-course or -program testing
- V = Voluntary
- R = Repeat testing
- Y = Purpose applies at least one component

#COM = Number of assessment components

SUBJECTS
- L = Language, including reading
- M = Mathematics
- W = Writing
- SS = Social studies
- Sc = Science
- V = Vocational
- Ap = Aptitude
- R = Readiness

TEST TYPE
- NRT = Norm-referenced test
- CRT = Criterion-referenced test
- Pr = Performance testing
- Pf = Portfolio assessment
- WS = Writing samples

ASSESSMENT PURPOSE
- K = Kindergarten or grade one readiness
- D = Student diagnosis or placement
- P = Student promotion
- G = High school graduation
- S = High school skills guarantee
- I = Improvement of instruction
- PE = Program evaluation
- A = Accountability, school performance monitoring
- Ac = School accreditation
- SA = Student awards or recognition
- ScA = School awards or recognition
- O = Other

EXPLANATORY NOTE: Most states conduct several assessment programs side-by-side (see the #COM column). This table aggregates across these assessment "components" to the state level. It must be interpreted cautiously, emphasizing the term "at least" in the following sense: Alaska conducts at least one assessment program assessing at least SOME fourth graders in language arts, mathematics, or writing; it also conducts at least one assessment of SOME fifth graders in language arts, mathematics, OR writing; Alaska makes use of an NRT and a writing sample; it tests to improve instruction, for program evaluation, and for accountability purposes. The totals at the bottom of the table are read similarly: these states each conduct at least one of these assessment "components."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

	Grades Assessed													
ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
AK	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Language Arts
AK	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Math
AK	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Reading
AK	-	-	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	-	-	V	-	Writing -- Writing
AL	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	Alabama Basic Competency Tests -- Language Arts
AL	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	Alabama Basic Competency Tests -- Mathematics
AL	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	Alabama Basic Competency Tests -- Reading
AL	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	Alabama Direct Assessment of Writing -- Writing
AL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	Algebra I End-of-Course Test -- Mathematics
AL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	Differential Aptitude Test w/Career Interest -- Aptitudes
AL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	High School Graduation Examination -- Language
AL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	High School Graduation Examination -- Mathematics
AL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	High School Graduation Examination -- Reading
AL	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Integrated Reading/Writing Assessment, Gr. 2 -- Reading Comprehension
AL	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Integrated Reading/Writing Assessment, Gr. 2 -- Writing
AL	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Language
AL	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Mathematics
AL	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Reading
AL	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Science
AL	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Social Studies
AR	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Arkansas Minimum Performance Test -- Language Arts
AR	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Arkansas Minimum Performance Test -- Math
AR	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Arkansas Minimum Performance Test -- Reading
AR	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Arkansas Minimum Performance Test -- Science
AR	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Arkansas Minimum Performance Test -- Social Studies
AR	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Language
AR	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Math
AR	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Reading
AR	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Science
AR	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Social Studies
AR	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	A	-	Writing Assessment -- Writing
AZ	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A*	District Assessment Plans -- Math
AZ	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A*	District Assessment Plans -- Reading
AZ	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A*	District Assessment Plans -- Writing
AZ	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Tests -- Language Arts
AZ	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Tests -- Math
AZ	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Tests -- Reading
AZ	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Statewide Performance-Based Assessment -- Math
AZ	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Statewide Performance-Based Assessment -- Reading
AZ	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Statewide Performance-Based Assessment -- Writing
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	Career-Technical Assessment Project (C-TAP) -- Animal Science
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	Career-Technical Assessment Project (C-TAP) -- Computer Sci/Info Systems
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	Career-Technical Assessment Project (C-TAP) -- Construction Tech
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	Career-Technical Assessment Project (C-TAP) -- Health Info Services
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	Career-Technical Assessment Project (C-TAP) -- Home Ec./Child Care
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Golden State Exams (HS end-of-course) -- Algebra
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Golden State Exams (HS end-of-course) -- Biology
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Golden State Exams (HS end-of-course) -- Chemistry
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Golden State Exams (HS end-of-course) -- Economics
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Golden State Exams (HS end-of-course) -- Geometry
CA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Golden State Exams (HS end-of-course) -- U.S. History
CA	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Performance Assessment -- History
CA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Performance Assessment -- Math
CA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Performance Assessment -- Reading
CA	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Performance Assessment -- Science
CA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Performance Assessment -- Writing

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

	Grades Assessed													
ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
CO	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	ITBS/TAP -- Math
CO	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	ITBS/TAP -- Reading
CO	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	Math and Science Assessment -- Math
CO	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	Math and Science Assessment -- Science
CO	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	Writing -- Writing
CT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) -- Language Arts
CT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) -- Math
CT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) -- Science
CT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) -- Social Studies
CT	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) -- Language Arts
CT	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) -- Math
CT	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) -- Reading
CT	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) -- Writing
DE	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	Stanford Achievement Test -- Language Arts
DE	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	Stanford Achievement Test -- Math
DE	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	Stanford Achievement Test -- Reading
DE	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	Stanford Achievement Test -- Science
DE	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	Stanford Achievement Test -- Social Studies
DE	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Writing -- Writing
FL	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	Florida Writing Assessment Program -- Writing
FL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	Grade Ten Assessment Test (GTAT) -- Math
FL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	Grade Ten Assessment Test (GTAT) -- Reading
FL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Competency Test (HSCT) -- Math
FL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Competency Test (HSCT) -- Reading
FL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Competency Test (HSCT) -- Writing
GA	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Curriculum-Based Assessments (CBA) -- Health Education
GA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Curriculum-Based Assessments (CBA) -- Math
GA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Curriculum-Based Assessments (CBA) -- Reading
GA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Curriculum-Based Assessments (CBA) -- Science
GA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Curriculum-Based Assessments (CBA) -- Social Studies
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) -- English Language Art
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) -- Health Education
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) -- Math
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) -- Science
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) -- Social Studies
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) -- Writing
GA	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Kindergarten Assessment Program (GKAP) -- Communication
GA	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Kindergarten Assessment Program (GKAP) -- Logical/Mathematical
GA	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Kindergarten Assessment Program (GKAP) -- Personal/Physical
GA	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Kindergarten Assessment Program (GKAP) -- Social
GA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Math
GA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Reading
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing (HS) -- Math
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing (HS) -- Reading
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing (HS) -- Science
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing (HS) -- Social Studies
GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing (HS) -- Writing
GA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Writing Assessment -- Writing
HI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	V	V	Credit by Examination (CbyE) -- Content Areas (8)
HI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	Test of Essential Competencies (HSTEC) -- 15 competencies
HI	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Language
HI	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Math
HI	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Reading
IA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NO STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

	Grades Assessed													
ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Direct Writing Assessment (DWA) -- Writing
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Language Arts
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Math
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Reading
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Science
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Social Studies
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Study Skills
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Vocabulary
ID	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Testing -- Written Expression
IL	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Illinois Goals Assessment Program -- Math
IL	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Illinois Goals Assessment Program -- Reading
IL	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	Illinois Goals Assessment Program -- Science
IL	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	Illinois Goals Assessment Program -- Social Studies
IL	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Illinois Goals Assessment Program -- Writing
IN	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	Statewide Assessment -- Math
IN	-	-	A	A	-	-	A	-	A	A	-	-	-	Statewide Assessment -- Language Arts
IN	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Statewide Assessment -- Science
IN	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Statewide Assessment -- Social Studies
KS	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Mathematics -- Math
KS	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Reading -- Reading
KS	-	-	-	v	-	-	-	v	-	-	v	-	-	Writing -- Writing
KY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	KIRIS transitional assessment -- Math
KY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	KIRIS transitional assessment -- Reading
KY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	KIRIS transitional assessment -- Science
KY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	KIRIS transitional assessment -- Social Studies
KY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	KIRIS transitional assessment -- Writing
KY	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	Performance events -- Arts & Humanities
KY	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	Performance events -- Career/Voc. EducatioN
KY	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	Performance events -- Math
KY	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	Performance events -- Science
KY	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	Performance events -- Social Studies
KY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Portfolio assessment -- Math
KY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Portfolio assessment -- Writing
LA	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Kindergarten Develop. Readiness Screen. Prog. -- Developmental Areas
LA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	LA Education Assesment Program -- Language Arts
LA	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	LA Education Assesment Program -- Math
LA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	LA Education Assesment Program -- Writing
LA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	LA Graduation Exit Examination -- Math
LA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	LA Graduation Exit Examination -- Science
LA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	LA Graduation Exit Examination -- Social Studies
LA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	LA Graduation Exit Examination -- Writing
LA	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	LA Statewide Norm-Referenced Testing Program -- Language Arts
LA	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	LA Statewide Norm-Referenced Testing Program -- Math
LA	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	LA Statewide Norm-Referenced Testing Program -- Reading
LA	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	LA Statewide Norm-Referenced Testing Program -- Science
LA	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	LA Statewide Norm-Referenced Testing Program -- Social Studies
MA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Massachusetts Education Assessment Program -- Math
MA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Massachusetts Education Assessment Program -- Reading
MA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Massachusetts Education Assessment Program -- Science
MA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	Massachusetts Education Assessment Program -- Social Studies

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

	Grades Assessed														
											1	1	1		
ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
MD	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	CRTs -- Math
MD	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	CRTs -- Reading
MD	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	CRTs -- Science
MD	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	CRTs -- Social Studies
MD	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	CRTs -- Writing
MD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	High School Graduation Requirement -- Citizenship
MD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	High School Graduation Requirement -- Math
MD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	V	-	-	High School Graduation Requirement -- Reading
MD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	-	A	-	-	High School Graduation Requirement -- Writing
ME	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	State Tests -- Humanities
ME	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	State Tests -- Math
ME	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	State Tests -- Reading
ME	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	State Tests -- Science
ME	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	State Tests -- Social Studies
ME	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	State Tests -- Writing
MI	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Michigan Educational Assessment Program-MEAP -- Math
MI	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	Michigan Educational Assessment Program-MEAP -- Reading
MI	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Michigan Educational Assessment Program-MEAP -- Science
MN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	Minnesota Testing Program -- English Conventions
MN	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Health Education
MN	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Math
MN	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Music
MN	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Reading
MN	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Science
MN	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Social Studies
MN	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Visual Arts
MN	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	-	Minnesota Testing Program -- Writing
MO	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	Missouri Mastery and Achievement Test -- Math
MO	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	Missouri Mastery and Achievement Test -- Reading
MO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	Missouri Mastery and Achievement Test -- Science
MO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	Missouri Mastery and Achievement Test -- Social Studies
MO	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	Writing Assessment -- Writing
MS	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Basic Skills Assessment Program, Grade 5 -- Math
MS	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Basic Skills Assessment Program, Grade 5 -- Reading
MS	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Basic Skills Assessment Program, Grade 5 -- Writing
MS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R		Functional Literacy Examination (FLE) -- Math
MS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R		Functional Literacy Examination (FLE) -- Reading
MS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R		Functional Literacy Examination (FLE) -- Writing
MS	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Language
MS	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Math
MS	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Reading
MS	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Science
MS	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Stanford Achievement Test -- Social Studies
MS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Subject Area Testing Program (SATP) -- Algebra
MT	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Student Assessment Requirement -- Language Arts
MT	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Student Assessment Requirement -- Math
MT	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Student Assessment Requirement -- Reading
MT	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Student Assessment Requirement -- Science
MT	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Student Assessment Requirement -- Social Studies

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
NC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	North Carolina Testing Program -- Algebra/Geometry
NC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	North Carolina Testing Program -- H.S. Science
NC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	North Carolina Testing Program -- H.S. Social Studies
NC	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	North Carolina Testing Program -- Math
NC	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	North Carolina Testing Program -- Reading
NC	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	North Carolina Testing Program -- Science
NC	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	North Carolina Testing Program -- Social Studies
NC	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	North Carolina Testing Program -- Writing
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Language
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Math
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Reading
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Science
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Social Studies
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Spelling
ND	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Study Skills
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	State-Wide Standardized Testing -- Word Analysis
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing (Cognitive) -- Analogies
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing (Cognitive) -- Memory
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing (Cognitive) -- Sequences
ND	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	State-Wide Standardized Testing (Cognitive) -- Verbal Reasoning
NE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NO STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
NH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NO STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Grade 8 Early Warning Test -- Math
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Grade 8 Early Warning Test -- Reading
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Grade 8 Early Warning Test -- Writing
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	R*	Grade 9 High School Proficiency Test -- Math
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	R*	Grade 9 High School Proficiency Test -- Reading
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	R*	Grade 9 High School Proficiency Test -- Writing
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A R*	Grade 11 High School Proficiency Test -- Math
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A R*	Grade 11 High School Proficiency Test -- Reading
NJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A R*	Grade 11 High School Proficiency Test -- Writing
NM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	High School Competency Examination -- Language Arts
NM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	High School Competency Examination -- Math
NM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	High School Competency Examination -- Reading
NM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	High School Competency Examination -- Science
NM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	High School Competency Examination -- Social Studies
NM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	High School Competency Examination -- Writing
NM	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Standardized Testing Program -- Math
NM	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Standardized Testing Program -- Reading
NM	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Standardized Testing Program -- Spelling
NM	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Norm-Referenced Standardized Testing Program -- Vocabulary
NM	-	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Reading Assessment for Grades 1 and 2 -- Reading
NM	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	V	-	-	-	-	Writing Assessment -- Writing
NV	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	Analytic-Trait Scored Writing -- Writing
NV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	CTBS -- Language
NV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	CTBS -- Math
NV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	CTBS -- Reading
NV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A R	High School Proficiency Examination Program -- Math
NV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A R	High School Proficiency Examination Program -- Reading
NV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A R	High School Proficiency Examination Program -- Writing

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

	Grades Assessed													
ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	-	Occupational Education Proficiency Exams -- Career/Voc. Education
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	-	-	-*	Preliminary Competency Tests -- Reading
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	-	-	-*	Preliminary Competency Tests -- Writing
NY	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Program Evaluation Tests -- Science
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Program Evaluation Tests -- Social Studies
NY	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) -- Math
NY	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) -- Reading
NY	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) -- Writing
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	Regents Competency Tests -- Math
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	Regents Competency Tests -- Reading
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	Regents Competency Tests -- Science
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	Regents Competency Tests -- Social Studies
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	Regents Competency Tests -- Writing
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	Regents Examination Programs -- English
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	Regents Examination Programs -- Foreign Languages
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	-	Regents Examination Programs -- Math
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	E	E	Regents Examination Programs -- Science
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	Regents Examination Programs -- Social Studies
NY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	-	-	-	Second Language Proficiency Examinations -- Foreign Languages
OH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	R	Ninth-Grade Proficiency Testing -- Citizenship
OH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	R	Ninth-Grade Proficiency Testing -- Math
OH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	R	Ninth-Grade Proficiency Testing -- Reading
OH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	R	R	R	Ninth-Grade Proficiency Testing -- Writing
OH	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Tests -- Language
OH	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Tests -- Math
OH	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Tests -- Reading
OK	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	CRT -- Math
OK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	CRT -- Reading
OK	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	CRT -- Science
OK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	CRT -- Writing
OK	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Testing -- Language
OK	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Testing -- Math
OK	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Testing -- Reading
OK	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Testing -- Science
OK	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Achievement Testing -- Social Studies
OK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Writing Assessment -- Writing
OR	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Reading, Mathematics and Health -- Health Education
OR	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Reading, Mathematics and Health -- Math
OR	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Reading, Mathematics and Health -- Reading
OR	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Writing -- Writing
PA	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	R	Reading/Writing/Math State Assessment -- Math
PA	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	R	Reading/Writing/Math State Assessment -- Reading
PA	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	Reading/Writing/Math State Assessment -- Writing
RI	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Health -- Health Education
RI	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Reading and Math -- Math
RI	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Reading and Math -- Reading
RI	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Physical Fitness -- Physical Education
RI	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	Writing -- Writing

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
SC	-	A	A	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	R	R	Basic Skills Assessment Program -- Math
SC	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Basic Skills Assessment Program -- Readiness
SC	-	A	A	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	R	R	Basic Skills Assessment Program -- Reading
SC	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	-	-	Basic Skills Assessment Program -- Science
SC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	R	R	Basic Skills Assessment Program -- Writing
SC	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Program -- Language/English
SC	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Program -- Math
SC	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	-	A	-	A	-	-	Norm-Referenced Program -- Reading
SD	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Achievement and Ability Testing -- Math
SD	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Achievement and Ability Testing -- Reading
SD	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Achievement and Ability Testing -- Science
SD	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Achievement and Ability Testing -- Social Studies
SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	Career Assessment Program -- Career/Voc. Educatio
TN	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	Achievement Test -- Language
TN	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	Achievement Test -- Math
TN	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	Achievement Test -- Reading
TN	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	Achievement Test -- Science
TN	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	Achievement Test -- Social Studies
TN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	Competency Test -- Minimum Competency
TN	-	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	V	-	Writing Assessment -- Writing
TX	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas -- Language
TX	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas -- Math
TX	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas -- Reading
TX	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas -- Science
TX	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas -- Social Studies
TX	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	R	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) -- Math
TX	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	R	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) -- Reading
TX	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	-	A	R	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) -- Writing
UT	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	Core Curriculum Assessment Program -- Math
UT	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	Core Curriculum Assessment Program -- Reading
UT	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	Core Curriculum Assessment Program -- Science
UT	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Statewide Testing Program -- Language Arts
UT	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Statewide Testing Program -- Math
UT	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Statewide Testing Program -- Reading
UT	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Statewide Testing Program -- Science
UT	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Statewide Testing Program -- Social Studies
VA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	Competency Test (Literacy Passport) -- Math
VA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	Competency Test (Literacy Passport) -- Reading
VA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	Competency Test (Literacy Passport) -- Writing
VA	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Test -- Math
VA	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Test -- Reading
VA	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Test -- Science
VA	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Norm-Referenced Test -- Social Studies
VT	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	Portfolio: Writing and Mathematics -- Math
VT	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Portfolio: Writing and Mathematics -- Writing
VT	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	Uniform Test: Mathematics -- Math
VT	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	Uniform Test: Writing -- Writing
WA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Basic Assessment Program -- Math
WA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Basic Assessment Program -- Reading
WA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Basic Assessment Program -- Science
WA	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	Basic Assessment Program -- Social Studies

SUMMARY OF STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM COMPONENTS

LEGEND: A = All are tested
S = Sample is tested
E = End-of-course or program testing for all participants
V = Testing is voluntary
R = Repeat testing till pass

	Grades Assessed													
											1	1	1	
ST	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	Program Component -- Subject Assessed
WI	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Third Grade Reading Test (TGRT) -- Reading
WI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	Wisconsin Student Assessment Program (WSAS) -- English
WI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	Wisconsin Student Assessment Program (WSAS) -- Math
WI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	Wisconsin Student Assessment Program (WSAS) -- Reading
WI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	Wisconsin Student Assessment Program (WSAS) -- Science
WI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	Wisconsin Student Assessment Program (WSAS) -- Writing
WV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills -- Language
WV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills -- Math
WV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills -- Reading
WV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills -- Science
WV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills -- Social Studies
WV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills -- Spelling
WV	-	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	-	A	-	A	-	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills -- Study Skills
WV	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	Criterion-Referenced Tests -- Math
WV	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	Criterion-Referenced Tests -- Reading
WV	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	A	-	A	-	-	Writing Assessment -- Writing
WY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NO STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Notes:
AZ Districts must report at grades 3, 8, and 11. They may test more grades.
NJ Grade 9 being phased out; Grade 11 will replace.
NY Schools choose whether to test in grade 8 or 9.

Acknowledgments

A special thank you goes to Jeri Nowakowski, Executive Director of North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, for the initial conception of this project and for the generous provision of staff to prepare this paper. Another special thanks goes to Rod Riffel who guided this project for the NEA and remained patient and helpful through the revisions of numerous drafts. He and others at NEA, as well as Dean Arrasmith of Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Julie Bell of the National Council of State Legislators, Patricia Ceperley of Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Gary Estes of the Far West Laboratory, Joan Herman of the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, Wes Hoover of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Diane Kell of The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands/The Network, Inc., and Andrew Porter of the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, all reviewed drafts of the report and offered very helpful suggestions for revision. We are especially grateful to the state testing directors and their staff who were interviewed and reviewed drafts of the document — Sue Bennett, California; Richard Peters and Donna Long, Indiana; Bob Gabrys, Steve Ferrara and Barbara Kapinus, Maryland; Diane Smolen and Peggy Dutcher, Michigan; Phyllis Stolpe, Texas; and Susan Rigney, Vermont. Shannon Cahill and Felicia Bohannon of NCREL conducted telephone interviews and summarized them, and Craig Sauter assisted with the re-writing of the opening sections of the report. Deanna Durrett, Director of the Regional Policy Information Center at NCREL, and Dena Stoner, Director of CEDaR, provided wise counsel concerning the recommendations and conclusions. And finally, most sincere thanks to Üllik Rouk of CEDaR who spent countless hours reviewing each draft of the report, providing considerable feedback and support, and editing the report into its final form.

The Authors

nea
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

CEDaR
Council for Educational Development and Research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE